

Hamming Width vs Novelty Width and Combinations

Bachelor's Thesis

Faculty of Science of the University of Basel
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
Artificial Intelligence
https://ai.dmi.unibas.ch

Examiner: Prof. Dr. Malte Helmert Supervisor: Simon Dold

> Valdrin Sheremetaj sheremetajv@gmail.com 2021-059-779

Abstract

The efficiency of classical planning problems varies significantly across problem instances, to explain and potentially exploit these variances, researchers have introduced several width-based complexity measures, such as novelty width and hamming width. These two measures offer different insights to understand the inherent difficulty of planning tasks. In this work, we analyze novelty width and hamming width and compare them, by examining their empirical behaviors and relative strengths. We also explore the implications of combining these width notions, providing a unified framework for understanding their roles in modern AI planners.

Table of Contents

Abstract				
1	Intr	\mathbf{r} oduction	1	
2	Preliminaries			
	2.1	Classical Planning	2	
	2.2	Width	2	
		2.2.1 Persistent Width	2	
	2.3	Search Framework	3	
	2.4	State Spaces?	4	
3	Wio	lth-Based Complexity Measures	5	
	3.1	Hamming Width	5	
	3.2	Novelty Width	5	
	3.3	Conceptual Comparison	5	
4	The	eoretical Analysis	6	
	4.1	Formal Properties of Hamming Width	6	
	4.2	Formal Properties of Novelty Width	6	
	4.3	Relationship	6	
5	Imp	plementation	7	
	5.1	Implementation of Hamming Width Search	7	
	5.2	Implementation of Novelty Width Search	7	
6	$\mathbf{Em}_{\mathbf{j}}$	pirical Evaluation	8	
	6.1	Experimental Setup	8	
	6.2	Results and Analysis	8	
		6.2.1 Hamming Width Search	8	
		6.2.2 Novelty Width Search	8	
		6.2.3 Hamming Width Search vs Novelty Width Search	8	
		6.2.4 Combinations	8	
7	Con	Conclusion		

Table of Contents	iv
Bibliography	10
Appendix A Appendix	11

1 Introduction

Planning is an important area in artificial intelligence, which allows a system to decide which sequence of actions it needs to take, to achieve a certain goal. In the context of classical planning, we aim to find such a plan under the assumptions of a static, fully observable environment where all actions are deterministic. Since many general AI planning problems are PSPACE-complete or NP-hard, it makes them computationally infeasible in worst-case scenarios, but still many real-world instances are solved remarkably efficiently by modern planners. Which makes us question: how do we create these effective planners that work well in practice? One promising approach focuses on the so-called width based complexity measures. These measures capture how much of the problem's state space needs to be considered to make progress towards the goal. We will center on two such measures: Hamming Width by Chen and Giménez (2007) and Novelty width by Lipovetzky and Geffner (2012). They both have different approaches on how to navigate the state space. Hamming Width by Chen and Giménez (2007) focuses on the minimum number of state variables that must be changed in order to reach a new state where more goal conditions are satisfied, without undoing any previously satisfied goals. Novelty width by Lipovetzky and Geffner (2012) on the other hand refers to the minimum number of facts that need to be examined simultaneously in order to determine whether a state is novel—that is, not a duplicate of any previously visited state during breadth-first search. Hence, Novelty width emphasizes the informational value of new states, while Hamming width emphasizes structural locality and incremental improvement. Understanding how these approaches relate to each other is not only theoretically interesting but also practically useful for informing the design of planning algorithms that are both efficient and robust across domains. That's why the overarching goal of this thesis is to conduct a a comprehensive analysis of Hamming Width and Novelty Width—both theoretically and empirically—and to investigate their relationships with each other. We do that by implementing them in the planing system Fast Downward, based on the Search Framework provided by Dold(2021).

2 Preliminaries

In this chapter we introduce important definitions, which we will use throughout this thesis.

2.1 Classical Planning

The classical model for planning is a 5-tuple $S = \langle S, s_0, S_G, A, f \rangle$, where S a finite set of possible states, s_0 is the **initial state**, $S_G \subseteq S$ is the **set of goals**, $a \in A(s)$ denotes the **set of actions**, where A(s) is the set of actions applicable in the state $s \in S$, and f is our **transition function** $f: S \times A \to S$ that maps a state-action pair (s, a) to the resulting state s' = f(s, a). We define a **plan** P (for an instance S) as a sequence of actions $a_0, \ldots a_m$ that generates a state sequence of $s_0, s_1 \ldots s_{m+1}$ such that $a_i \in A(s_i)$, $s_{i+1} = f(a_i, s_i)$ and $s_{m+1} \in S_G$. Intuitively this means that each action a_i is available in the current state s_i , applying a_i to s_i correctly moves us to the next state s_{i+1} and the final state s_{m+1} is a goal state.

FORMALIZATIONS OR GENERAL DEFINITION?

2.2 Width

In this section we provide an understanding on the general notion of width, to make it possible for us to understand the different notions of width explained later on.

FINISH WIDTH NOTION HERE OR ON CHAPTER 3 (What notion?)

2.2.1 Persistent Width

Preliminaries 3

2.3 Search Framework

We will introduce the **Search Framework** by Dold(2021), which we will use for our implementation of the Hamming Width Search and Novelty Width Search algorithms. It allows us to specify search algorithms, by only 3 subroutines named **progressCheck**, **expand-Check** and **updateClosed**. We will implement these algorithms ourselves according to the properties of our Hamming- and Novelty Width Search. The pseudocode for the algorithm provided already by Dold(2021) is shown here.

Algorithm 1 Search Framework

```
1: Data: planning task \Pi = \langle V, I, O, \gamma \rangle, width k \in \mathbb{N}, heuristic h,
2: subroutines updateClosed, progressCheck, expandCheck
3: Result: plan \pi
4: if \gamma \subseteq I then
       return empty plan
5:
6: end if
7: open := [I]
8: closed := \emptyset
9: updateClosed(I, closed, k)
{\it 10:}\ reference := I
   while open is not empty do
11:
        current := pop first element of open
12:
        for all candidate \in succ(current) do
13:
           if \gamma \subseteq candidate then
14:
               return extracted path to candidate
15:
           else if progressCheck(candidate, reference, h) then
16:
               open := [candidate]
17:
               closed := \emptyset
18:
               updateClosed(candidate, closed, k)
19:
               reference := candidate
20:
               break
21:
22:
           else if expandCheck(candidate, closed, k) then
               updateClosed(candidate, closed, k)
23:
24:
               append candidate to open
           end if
25:
        end for
26:
   end while
28: return fail
```

It defines a general skeleton for our search algorithms in planning tasks, by searching through states, while trying to reach a goal state γ and managing both open (states to explore) and closed states (states already explored). It does that by initializing first, while checking if the goal γ is already reached. If it does agree the search is already over. If it is not reached already, we initialize the open list containing only the initial state I. The closed set is initialized with the empty set, symbolizing that no state is reached yet and immediately updated by the subroutine **updateClose** with the initial state I. Dold(2021) also added a reference state reference, which first remembers the starting state and later helps to see if progress was made. After the initialization, we enter the main while loop, which runs as long as the open list contains at least one state. Inside the loop we first assign the first element

Preliminaries 4

of the open list to the current state *current*, then we iterate (in an arbitrary order) over each *candidate* that are a successor of current with a for-loop. For each of those *candidates*, we will first check if we already found a goal, we then return the path and the search is over. If this is not the case, we check if progress was made with the **progressCheck** subroutine. If that's true, we reinitialize the open list, the closed set and the *reference* state. The closed set becomes the empty set again, and will be updated again by **updateClosed** while using the *candidate* state. The open list then contains only the *candidate* state and *reference* gets updated to *candidate* and the for loop breaks. If candidate both provides no progress and is not agreeing with the goal, then we test *candidate* if it should be expanded further. We accomplish this, by checking it with the subroutine **expandCheck**. If *candidate* should be expanded further, we call the subroutine **updateClosed** on *candidate* to add elements into the closed set and append *candidate* to the open list. If the while loop ends, no solution was found and it terminates with a fail return.

2.4 State Spaces?

We will use State Spaces to give us a more structured way to represent all the possible configurations or situations that a system could be in.

A state space is a 6-tuple $S = \langle S, A, cost, T, s_I, s_G \rangle$ with a finite set of possible states S, finite set of actions A, action costs $cost : A \to \mathbb{R}^+_{\not{\vdash}}$, the transition relation $T \subseteq S \times A \times S$, an initial state $s_I \in S$ and a goal state or set of goal states $s_G \subseteq S$. We will visualize these state spaces as directed and labeled graphs, where nodes represent our states and edges represent our actions, labeled with the actions cost of the corresponding transition.

MATHEMATICAL FORMALIZATION REQUIRED IF NEEDED IN THESIS

3 Width-Based Complexity Measures

- 3.1 Hamming Width
- 3.2 Novelty Width
- 3.3 Conceptual Comparison

4 Theoretical Analysis

- 4.1 Formal Properties of Hamming Width
- 4.2 Formal Properties of Novelty Width
- 4.3 Relationship

5 Implementation

- 5.1 Implementation of Hamming Width Search
- 5.2 Implementation of Novelty Width Search

6 Empirical Evaluation

- 6.1 Experimental Setup
- 6.2 Results and Analysis
- 6.2.1 Hamming Width Search
- 6.2.2 Novelty Width Search
- 6.2.3 Hamming Width Search vs Novelty Width Search
- 6.2.4 Combinations

7 Conclusion

Bibliography

A Appendix



Faculty of Science



Declaration on Scientific Integrity (including a Declaration on Plagiarism and Fraud) Translation from German original

Title of Thesis:					
Name Assessor:					
Name Student:					
Matriculation No.: I attest with my signature that I have written this work independently and without outside help. I also attest that the information concerning the sources used in this work is true and complete in every respect. All sources that have been quoted or paraphrased have been marked accordingly.					
Place, Date:	_ Student:				
Will this work, or parts of it, be published	?				
No					
in the library, on the research dat document server of the department.	at I agree to a publication of the work (print/digital cabase of the University of Basel and/or on the Likewise, I agree to the bibliographic reference in vice Platform). (cross out as applicable)				
Publication as of:					
Place, Date:	_ Student:				
Place, Date:	_ Assessor:				

Please enclose a completed and signed copy of this declaration in your Bachelor's or Master's thesis.